

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,266	04/05/2001	James G. Skakoon	723.041US1	4355
21186 75	590 02/27/2006		EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH			JUNG, WILLIAM C	
1600 TCF TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			3737	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-
1/
1/

00,007,000					
09/827,266	SKAKOON ET AL.				
Examiner	Art Unit				
William Jung	3737				
ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
<u>ly 2005</u> .					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					
	Examiner William Jung ears on the cover sheet with the covers on the covers on the covers of the covers o				

Application/Control Number: 09/827,266 Page 2

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPO 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

37 CFR 1.105 REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION

- 1. Applicant (or the assignee of this application if the assignee has undertaken the prosecution of the application) is required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application.
- 2. There are numerous other co-pending applications and issued patents, which disclose and claim very similar and/or identical subject matter. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.105 and MPEP

Art Unit: 3737

704.11(a) subsection G, applicant (or the assignee) is respectfully requested to disclose all copending applications and related patents (please see the non-exhaustive list below of applications and issued patents that the USPTO believes may be related) and identify the specific claims of those applications and/or patents which may present double patenting issues with the instant application claims. This requirement is reasonably necessary to examination because, based on an initial review of the applications, there is a significant degree of overlap in claimed subject matter, thus requiring an analysis of commonality of claimed subject matter to determine patentability under 35 USC 101 double patenting and/or obviousness type double patenting. For example, claims 1-32 of application 09/827,266 differ from claims 1- of application 09/078,913, now US Patent No. 5,993,463 (from hereon refer to as '463) in only the obvious variation of introducing limitation of MR compatible cable to be used with guiding apparatus and method. '463 does no specify specific imaging system used to navigate the guiding device, except that "the cable is made of material, which is compatible in the imaging environment" (see claim 13). The claims 13 here broadly contemplate using imaging system to navigate the device, which in the state of art at the time of invention includes MRI, CT, ultrasound, etc. Because the applicant (or the assignee) is presumably far more cognizant of the contents of the claims in these applications than any Office staff, and has access to the source documents by which such comparison could be done better than within the Office, it is reasonable to require the applicant to provide the information needed to determine the commonality among the claims.

Should applicant (or the assignee) believe that Double Patenting exists, then applicant (or the

assignee) is invited to file Terminal Disclaimers and/or amend the currently pending claims in

the interest of expediting the prosecution of the current application. Applicant (or the assignee)

Application/Control Number: 09/827,266

Art Unit: 3737

should note that a terminal disclaimer is effective to overcome an obviousness type double patenting rejection, but will not overcome a "same type" double patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

3. Non-exhaustive list of possible related co-pending applications and patents:

US 20040260323A1 (10/894,100)

US 20040255991A1 (10/894,466)

US 20040176750A1 (10/801,299)

US 20040059260A1 (10/672,755)

US 20030079287A1 (10/260,697)

US 20020156372A1 (10/175,668)

US 20020077646A1 (09/919,583)

US 20020052610A1 (09/828,451)

US 20020019641A1 (09/970,262)

US 20010037524A1 (09/849,792)

US 20010014771A1 (09/792,566)

US 6,944,895 B2

US 6,802,323 B1

US 6,782,288 B2

US 6,773,443 B2

US 6,752,812 B1

US 6,726,678 B1

US 6,632,184 B1

Application/Control Number: 09/827,266

Art Unit: 3737

US 6,537,232 B1

US 6,368,329 B1

US 6,267,770 B1

US 6,267,769 B1

US 6,257,407 B1

US 6,206,890 B1

US 6,195,577 B1

US 5,993,463 A

US 5,964,705 A

4. This requirement is subject to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.134, 1.135 and 1.136 and has a shortened statutory period of 2 months. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Jung, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-4739. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/827,266 Page 6

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WJ

February 19, 2006

BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700